

4-260085  
WAPATO ROADRUNNER

Zillich  
(509)

3/14/96 — Voice Mail message taken from Robert Cutler:

- "500 gallons lost during a tank test" — 707 W. 15<sup>th</sup> St. Wapato
- "John Zillich" in charge 509/545-0136

3/15/96 @ Dept V: —

3/19/96 — Job 2. @ intending to pull 3-12K tanks  
today & future — ?

3/26/96 Robert Cutler 50' x 50' x 16' deep, clean soils 200 CY, sample well. Sheen a groundwater! — More wells going in! (less USTs - 177 CY) ? #200CY

Bob Zillich

Mayer + Fire Dept. out there yest.

GK to sid letter to Ruffner

509/582-7447  
545-0136 Passo  
(New #)  
0128 FAX

3/26/96 Call f. Zillich:

- 3-12K USTs
- 500-600 gals. gas lost
- all USTs + Dispensers taken out
- 3/19 - 21 all the way to GW! Sheen  
FCS

3 MWs @ Shell  
intend to 1 MW more @ Ruffners

~~(not a tank test)~~  
→ 200CY trucked to  
Reilly Kelly Oil site —  
bioremediate (OK to 12)

4/3/96 — Jeffy Brown (Zillich Co.)

500 gals. — gas —  
GW clean (?)  
tested

yes spread out

**From:** LAURIS DAVIES (LDAVIES)  
**To:** ddossett  
**Date:** Thursday, February 22, 1996 8:51 am  
**Subject:** CFC Inspection Training -Forwarded -Repl

Forwarded mail received from: GKEELER  
Geoff raises some good questions (I KNEW the experienced ones would!). Can you give these some thought (don't worry about the last one, that one's for me)?

**CC:** skawabat

**Files:** m0:MESSAGE

=====  
**From:** PATRICK FOLEY (PFOLEY)  
**To:** ANolan, DDossett, GKeeler  
**Date:** Thursday, February 22, 1996 2:32 pm  
**Subject:** CFC Inspection Training -Forwarded -Repl

Forwarded mail received from: ROAIR1:DDOSSETT

2.a. These inspections can and should be done with no forewarning to company. The chance of finding a violation would be smaller if it was announced and the company had a chance to prepare. No site specific preparation is necessary. It might be good to know if we have received site specific complaints from the public that might be violating, but even that is not necessary just helpful.

b. Level of followup involvement is more a question for Armina but I am sure she/we could handle all of the followup work with exception of being a witness for first inspection.

3. Tribal Lands are not a problem if you are an EPA inspector. This is a nationally applicable regulation which applies equally to tribal lands and states. As an EPA inspector you have access authority under Section 114 of the CAA. If denied access you should go through the same procedures you normally would in any EPA program: explain your authority, call ORC and seek a warrant in that order. Tribal Lands might be a problem if you are a county or state inspector who is being denied access.

**CC:** HSCott, LDavies, SKawabat, PWong

**Files:** m0:MESSAGE, m1:MESSAGE, m2:MESSAGE